MYSORE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

THIRTY-SEVENTH DAY.

Wednesday, 22nd July 1953.

The House met in the Legislative Assembly Hall, Old Public Offices, Bangalore, at Thirty Minutes past Eight of the Clock.

Mr. SPEAKER (Sri H. SIDDAIYA, B.A., LL.B.) in the Chair.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

Appointment of Ex-Registrar of Mysore University as Professor.

Q.—282. Sri M. LINGANNA (Nanjangud).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) whether the ex-Registrar of Mysore University is recommended to a post of Professorship;

(*b*) if so, when;

(*c*) what is the grade of Professorship he is recommended for and the grounds on which such recommendations are made?

A.—Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—

(*a*) He is already a Professor.

(*b*) Does not arise.

(*c*) He is appointed in grade Rs. 700—30—850 on the recommendation of the University.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಲಿಂಗಣ್ಣ.—ಅವರನ್ನು ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರಾಗಿ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದ ತಾರೀಖನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತೀರಾ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರರಾವ್.—15-7-53ರಲ್ಲಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಲಿಂಗಣ್ಣ.—ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರಾರ್‌ರವರನ್ನು ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರಾಗಿ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ಈ ಗ್ರೇಡನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ತಾನೆ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರರಾವ್.—ಹೌದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಲಿಂಗಣ್ಣ.—ಸಂಬಳದ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಿಂದೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದ ಗ್ರೇಡ್ ಯಾವುದು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರರಾವ್.—400-25-700.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಲಿಂಗಣ್ಣ.—ಈ ಗ್ರೇಡ್‌ನಿಂದ 700-850 ರೂಪಾಯಿನ ಗ್ರೇಡಿಗೆ ಅವರನ್ನು ಏರಿಸಲು ಕಾರಣವೇನು?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—That is the recommendation of the University.

Mr. SPEAKER.—He gets it in the usual course. Please see the Civil List.

Sri M. RAJASEKHARA MURTHY.—Is it a fact that the order of upgrading the post and the order of transfer were passed simultaneously?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Yes.

Sri M. RAJASEKHARA MURTHY.—May I know whether the upgrading of the post or the transfer was recommended by the University Council?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Both were recommended by the University Council so far back as 14th December 1951.

Sri M. RAJASEKHARA MURTHY.—Is it not a fact that by the upgrading of the post and the transfer of the person in question, you have overlooked the seniority of so many other people?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—No seniority has been overlooked.

Sri M. RAJASEKHARA MURTHY.—If that is brought to your notice, will the Government reconsider the case?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—We will examine the position.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ವಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—ಅವರನ್ನು ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರಾಗಿ ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಿದ್‌ಲಾ, ಅವರಿಗಿಂತ ಸೀನಿಯರ್ ಆದವರು ಯಾರೂ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರರಾವ್.—ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ ವಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹರೆಡ್ಡಿ.—ಅವರನ್ನು ಪ್ರೊಫೆಸರಾಗಿ ಶಿಫಾರಸು ಮಾಡಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದರಲ್ಲ ಆಗ ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಂಬಳ ಅವರು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರರಾವ್.—ನೋಟೀಸ್ ಬೇಕು.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—May I know when this officer was appointed as Second Class Professor ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—The date is not readily available with me.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—May I know how many persons were there as Second Class Professors at the time when this officer was appointed as Second Class Professor ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—With reference to the vacancy in the Training College, the appointment will have to be considered.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—My question is, in the category of Second Class Professors, how many were there at the time when this person was appointed as Second Class Professor ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Notice.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Were there not dozens of persons as Second Class Professors at the time when this gentleman was appointed as Second Class Professor ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—There may be others in that cadre also.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Then what were the special reasons for giving him the first grade when several others who were senior to him were yet in the second grade ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—It is with reference, as I said, to the vacancy in the Training College and this was the seniormost gentleman who could be appointed for that post.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—How many such vacancies are there in the cadre of Rs. 700—30—850 in the Training College ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Two.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Is the answer given with reference to grade Rs. 700—30—850 ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Yes ; two vacancies.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Will the Minister be pleased to refer to the file and give the answer ? I know there is only one vacancy of Second Class and one vacancy of First Class.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—There was one vacancy of First Class and one of Second Class ; that of Second Class was upgraded to First Class. Hence it became two.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Is it to accommodate the person in question that the second class vacancy was upgraded to first class ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—It may be put like that in view of the circumstances that are there.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—May I know what were the special reasons which prompted the Government to approve of the recommendation of the University Council for giving him the first grade when there were other seniors to him ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—The repeated resolutions of the University Council led the Government to make the appointment.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—The University Council must have given some reasons while making the recommendations. I want to know what were the reasons ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—The main reason was that one appointment was given to Professor Deve Gowda and the other appointment also had to be made and that was made and it was given to Sri Rangachar.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Which was the one appointment that was given to Sri A. C. Deve Gowda ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Place of Senior Professor of the Training College.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Was he not a Second Class Professor before he became a First Class Professor ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Necessarily for some years he was.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Are the Government aware that an answer was given on the floor of this House that promotion from Second Class to First Class is governed by strict seniority?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I am not aware of any such answer given.

Reversion of decision to open Toddy Shops in 1953-54.

Q.—285. Sri N. C. NAGAIAH REDDY (Goribidnur).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) whether Sri T. Channiah, Excise Minister, announced to the Press that two hundred toddy shops would be reopened during the year 1953-54;

(*b*) if so, the reasons for such a step;

(*c*) whether that decision was reversed within 48 hours and the reasons therefor?

A.—Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—

(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) According to the Prohibition Policy pursued by the Government during 1947-48, a 20 per cent cut of the excise shops and of the quantities of exciseable articles supplied to the shops was effected. During 1948-49, total prohibition by districts was introduced, starting with Kolar, Tumkur and Chitaldrug, and thus the prohibition policy was totally revised. But the shops closed as per old policy were not reopened. As there was demand for the reopening of the said shops, Government decided to reopen them excluding the 5-mile dry belt area along the Madras border, in all wet areas.

(*c*) The decision was not reversed in 48 hours. As there were representations from several quarters to the effect that such a step would be considered as a reversal of the Prohibition Policy, it was decided to maintain the *status quo*.

Sri N. C. NAGAIAH REDDY.—"As there was demand for the reopening of the said shops, Government decided to reopen them" ಎಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಲ್ಲಾ, ಯಾರು ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು reopen ಮಾಡ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡರು? ಯಾರಾದರೂ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದರೆ?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Representations from the public were made.

Sri H. C. LINGA REDDY.—When was the Excise portfolio changed?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—It was not changed and has not been changed.

Point of order regarding one Minister answering for another while both are present.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—I rise to a point of order. With regard to the issue raised whether any Minister could answer on behalf of any other Minister, so far as that aspect is concerned, the Chair was pleased to give a ruling that any Minister in the absence of any other Minister, could answer on behalf of the Minister who was absent. But here in view of the fact that the Excise portfolio has not been changed and in view of the fact that the Excise Minister is present in the House, I take exception to the fact that another Minister should be allowed to answer for him. I am not basing my observations on this particular aspect from any other point of view; I am doing so from the point of view that the procedure should be regular, from the point of view of constitutional propriety, that it should not be allowed. So from these points of view, I submit that whenever there is the Minister of the concerned portfolio and for which he is responsible, he should be asked to answer the questions pertaining to his Department. But whenever the particular Minister is absent, in his